

Remarks

Claims 1-20, 23-36, and 38 are pending in the application. Claims 21, 22, and 37 have been canceled. Claims 1, 23-30, and 36 have been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested.

Allowance

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2-13, 17-20, 31-33, 35 and 37-38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 21, 23, 24, 34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wahler et al. Apparently with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the examiner states that Wahler discloses a hub comprising a first opening extending axially into the hub, the first opening having an inner surface; an integral key (6) extending radially inward from the inner surface of the first opening; and an integral stop (4") extending across at least a portion of one of the first and second ends of the opening.

However, applicant has amended claim 1 to include a limit from now canceled claim 21:

an integral key extending radially inward from said inner surface of said first opening for engaging said keyway for preventing relative rotation of said hub on said shaft when said hub is disposed on said shaft

Applicant would ask the Examiner to consider that there is no teaching or suggestion in Wahler to provide an integral key extending radially inward from said inner surface of said first opening for engaging said keyway for preventing relative rotation of said hub on said shaft when said hub is disposed on said shaft.

Griddles 6 of Wahler do not prevent relative rotation; actually rotation is prevented by protrusion 7 that fits into groove 7' of shaft 2. Griddles (6) of Wahler perform a different function entirely; they hold shaft 2 in the opening against protrusion 7 so shaft 2 does not come out of protrusion 7. Without protrusion 7 preventing relative rotation, shaft 2 would rotate as griddles 6 slide in circular groove 6'.

Since Wahler uses protrusion 7 to prevent relative rotation of hub on shaft there would be no reason to also provide an integral key extending radially inward from the inner surface of the first opening for engaging the keyway for preventing relative rotation of the hub on said shaft when the hub is disposed on the shaft. Thus, the present invention, as amended, is clearly distinguished from the teaching and suggestion of Wahler. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, as amended, and claims dependent thereon, has been traversed.

Claim 37 has been rewritten in independent form by including it with the limits of claim 36, as suggested by the Examiner to provide new claim 36. The Examiner has said this would make claim 37 allowable. By including the limits of claim 37 in claim 36, claim 36 should therefore be allowable.

The Examiner rejects claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. The examiner states that "Johnson discloses a hub comprising a first face and a second face, an opening extending there between, the opening having a length between the first face and the second face, the opening having a circular shape except for an integral key substantially the entire length of the opening, the opening and the key having a keyway."

However, applicant would ask the Examiner to consider that a key feature of Johnson is that the opening **does not** have a circular shape except for the integral key. Instead Johnson provides fillets 40 that **cause opening 28 to deviate from a circular shape in the region next to key 30**. Thus, Johnson teaches against the idea of "the opening having a circular shape except for an integral key," as provided in claim 34. Johnson's fillets 40 are needed to overcome problems introduced by providing that the shaft will be squeezed when groove 26 of the split hub is compressed. Fillets 40 are essential to the disclosure of Johnson. Claim 34 is clearly distinguished from Johnson since it provides "a circular shape except for an integral key." The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) has therefore been traversed.

Claim Rejections--35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner states that claims 14-16 are rejected as being product by process and not given patentable weight, and since claims 15-16 further limit claim 14, they are also rejected. Further the Examiner notes that Johnson teaches powdered metal elements and that they are well known in the art. However, since claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinguished, dependent claims 14-16 are also distinguished. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been traversed.

The Examiner rejects claims 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Wahler. The Examiner acknowledges that there is no teaching of the shapes

provided in these claims. The Examiner states that the shapes are considered to be a design consideration within the skill in the art. However, since claim 1, as amended, is clearly distinguished, dependent claims 25-30 are also distinguished. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been traversed.

Entry of the Present Amendment after Final

Applicant requests that the present amendment be entered. Applicant is presenting this amendment under 37 CFR 1.116. The present amendments comply with a requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office action. The amendments present rejected claims in better form for allowance or consideration on appeal.

Applicant believes the present amendment to claim 1 and to claim 36 does not introduce new matter or new issues for search or consideration. The amendment to claim 1 adds a limit that is already in claim 21, now canceled. The additional limit overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103. The amendment materially assists in placing the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner has already searched this limit in connection with review of claim 21. Similarly, the amendment to claim 36 by the addition of the limit of claim 37 puts claim 36 in condition for allowance as stated by the Examiner. Furthermore, no amendment has been made to claim 34 which is clearly distinguished without any amendment, as described herein above.


Applicant believes that the proposed amendments to claims 1 and 36 place the case in better form for appeal, or in condition for allowance. (A) The claims, if amended as proposed, would avoid the rejections set forth in the last Office action, and thus the amendment would place the case in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal. (B) The claims, if amended as proposed, would not raise the issue of new matter since no new matter is included in any amendment. (C) The claims as amended present no new issues requiring further consideration or search since the limit added to claim 1 was copied from claim 21, now canceled. (D) The amendment presents no additional claims.

Applicant understands that the refusal to enter the proposed amendment should not be arbitrary. The proposed amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified. (MPEP 714.13).

In view of the fact that a request for a personal interview after final should be granted (MPEP 714.12), applicant requests that personal interview and asks that the Examiner schedule that interview at his earliest convenience on a Tuesday, Thursday or Friday as soon as possible.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration. If there are any questions please call applicant's attorney at 802 864-1575.

Respectfully submitted,
For: Tyler R. Dawson

By: 
James M. Leas
Registration Number 34,372
Tel: (802) 864-1575

James M. Leas
37 Butler Drive
S. Burlington, Vermont 05403